IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

CENTRAL DIVISION

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DUSTIN PEAD

October 5, 2017

Transcript of Electronically Recorded Motion Hearing

Laura W. Robinson, RPR, FCRR, CSR, CP 351 South West Temple 8.430 U.S. Courthouse Salt Lake City, Utah 84101 (801)328-4800

Appearances of Counsel:

For the Petitioner: Brian M. Pomerantz

Attorney at Law

6351 Owensmouth Avenue

Suite 203

Woodland Hills, California 91367

Ken Murray

Attorney at Law

316 E. Mitchell Drive Phoenix, Arizona 85012

For the Respondents: Erin Riley

Andrew F. Peterson Attorneys at Law

Utah Attorney General's Office

160 East 300 South

Sixth Floor

Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

1 Salt Lake City, Utah October 5, 2017 2 3 THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Dustin Pead, a magistrate judge, referral judge, 4 5 2:07-CV-194, Taylor versus Crowther. 6 Would counsel please make their appearance? 7 Mr. Pomerantz starting with you as petitioner. 8 MR. POMERANTZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Brian 9 Pomerantz on behalf of petitioner Von Taylor. 10 MR. MURRAY: And Ken Murray as well, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Thank you, gentlemen. And for the state. 12 MS. RILEY: Erin Riley and Andrew Peterson from the 13 Attorney General's Office for the respondent. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Riley, are you going to 15 speak today? 16 MS. RILEY: I am, yes. 17 THE COURT: I want to first, before we address the 18 motion to continue, indicate that I have had an opportunity to communicate with Mr. Pomerantz and Mr. Murray about some 19 20 issues I would like to ask Mr. Pomerantz to state how he 21 views the current motion and any requests he might make in 22 this regard. Mr. Pomerantz? 23 MR. POMERANTZ: We are requesting that the motion to 24 continue be stayed on consideration until Monday, and that 25 the discovery deadlines be moved back to Wednesday, if

1 necessary.

THE COURT: Um, Mr. Pomerantz, is it fair to say that you're still -- you're -- it's a fluid motion, you're considering whether you can go forward in earnestness with the already existing evidentiary hearing set for November.

MR. POMERANTZ: We are.

THE COURT: And Ms. Riley, they're saying look, we may need just a few more days to examine some situations that are going on to see how we want to move forward. It would require, if I adopt their proposal, pushing some dates. It would be pushing the things that are due on Friday and Saturday to next Wednesday, and then they would have to alert me and you by close of business on Monday whether they want to move forward in earnestness with the motion to continue. That's --

MS. RILEY: So would we not be arguing anything about the motion to continue today?

THE COURT: Right.

MS. RILEY: I guess I'm not clear why one more day would change things about that.

THE COURT: Well, I don't want to speak for

Mr. Pomerantz. All I'm saying is that it's a fluid

situation and they're trying to balance competing interests

versus going forward with the hearing versus the ability to

move forward with what they have. Mr. Pomerantz, would you

like to add anything to the record in that regard?

MR. POMERANTZ: We are trying to assess, based on the information we have, whether the continuance is necessary or not and we have not had time to digest all of the information that we received over the last two days in the deposition yet. So we're looking for time to digest that information to figure out whether it is necessary for us to continue this hearing or not.

THE COURT: My stated preference was that we could address this while they were in town so we could have an opportunity to go on a back and forth rather than a telephonic hearing. But I also have some interest in moving forward with the evidentiary hearing at least for Judge Campbell if we can do that. Um, so I think they tried to balance the desire from my end to make sure that we're addressing any motion to continue as quickly as possible, but I don't want to prematurely conclude that it should or must be continued unless they believe that it should. And they're indicating that they would like a little more time to do that.

MS. RILEY: Um, I guess I have two concerns, Your Honor. First is we are opposing the motion to continue in general at all and so our position is that we would prefer to go ahead and argue and argue why it shouldn't be granted no matter what, you know, whatever they come up with.

And then the second thing is, um, if it is stayed until Monday, is that then going to be a telephonic argument are you saying?

THE COURT: Yes, it would be set on Tuesday for telephonic.

MS. RILEY: So I, you know, I understand this is totally up to the court and at your discretion. Our position is we would prefer to go ahead and argue today and argue our position that there is not a basis for the continuance at all. Um, that would be our preference.

THE COURT: I think that is a very reasonable position. I'm going to go ahead and hold that decision in abeyance. We'll set it over. I'm going to ask you to alert the court and Ms. Riley and Mr. Peterson by no later than 4:00 p.m. mountain time in terms of whether you are moving forward with the motion to continue in earnest.

If there is a determination that the motion they want to proceed with the motion, we will do our very best to reach out to you all immediately and try to get a hearing set for Tuesday. I'll be conducting that hearing and we will go from there.

Meanwhile, there are deadlines for things that need to be turned over, motions in limine, exhibit and witness lists are due on Saturday, I believe. Is that correct,

Mr. Pomerantz?

1 MR. POMERANTZ: Motions in limine are due tomorrow, 2 the exhibit and witness lists are due on Saturday, Your 3 Honor. THE COURT: What else is due over the weekend, 4 5 Ms. Riley? Is there anything else? 6 MS. RILEY: Transcripts of prior depositions that any 7 party might anticipate presenting. MR. POMERANTZ: She is correct, Your Honor, 8 9 designation of transcripts. 10 THE COURT: And what I would like to do is we're going 11 to set all of those in abeyance and those will be -- the deadlines for those will all be collectively on Wednesday, 12 13 close of business by Wednesday. Of course, that's subject 14 to (A) whether they want to move forward on a motion to 15 continue, and (B) whether it is granted. 16 Assuming they do not want to move forward, or I deny 17 the motion to continue, that will be the new date for those 18 matters to be turned over. Mr. Pomerantz, anything else we need to address? 19 20 is one other matter. Mr. Pomerantz, why don't you go ahead 21 and address the second matter as best you can, please. 22 MR. POMERANTZ: We are -- we would like to, Your 23 Honor, withdraw Mr. Wong's expert report and redesignate him 24 as a consultant rather than as an expert witness.

THE COURT: So, Ms. Riley, um, there is a notice that

25

Mr. Pomerantz is making at this point. I am not prepared to discuss in detail some of the issues relating to that designation -- re-designation but they're withdrawing the report and considering him as a consultant, non-expert.

MS. RILEY: And that is, of course, a problem for us because our experts are rebuttal witnesses and so part of what they have done -- they have done is look at their expert's reports when they proceed with their reports.

MR. PETERSON: They have to designate new experts --

MS. RILEY: Right. So it's almost like we're going to be starting all over. If they're going to be designating a new expert, then our experts are going to have to be looking at it again.

THE COURT: Well, I guess that's the whole point. We don't know if they're designating new experts or seeking to designate new experts. That's the whole basis for holding the motion to continue in abeyance. So believe me I read you loud and clear this -- this is some potential problems. That's why on balance I would rather we wait until Monday, see what they want to do in earnestness and then we will have to go forward from there.

MS. RILEY: Will you be filing a written motion to withdraw his -- withdraw him as an expert?

THE COURT: Do you think that would be necessary?

MS. RILEY: Well, I guess I'm not sure what they're

anticipating by only calling him as a consultant. Does that then anticipate --

THE COURT: He is not then being called.

MS. RILEY: That our expert can't refer to or discuss or mention Mr. Wong's report? I mean I have some questions about what that means.

THE COURT: Mr. Pomerantz, is it fair to say the report is not going to be used at all by Mr. Taylor nor is he going to be called as a witness in the proceeding. Fair enough?

MR. POMERANTZ: Give me one moment, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. POMERANTZ: Um, correct, Your Honor. We would not be presenting the report, we would not be referring to the report in the hearing and Mr. Wong would not be testifying at the hearing. That's the purpose of, as you said, re-designating him as a consultant. He will not appear at the hearing at all.

THE COURT: So in terms of the rebuttal to Dr. Wong there is just no utility for it, the report is no longer part of the record in the hearing.

MS. RILEY: Right. My concern is that by doing this today, withdrawing Mr. Wong's report, then they're putting themselves in a position where there is no expert. And I assume if they choose to go forward with the motion to

continue the evidentiary hearing they're going to cite that as a basis for why they need a continuance. It seems to me that they're, you know, that that is an issue there. If we go forward with the evidentiary hearing then they have no firearms ballistic report or expert at all.

THE COURT: That's correct, um, and I am going to have to balance all of those things when we get to -- if we get to a motion to continue and um -- um, there are some matters that the court is not prepared to discuss that have impacted that decision here today which I'm not going to address, but it puts you in an awfully difficult position I understand everyone where you're coming from, but I think this is the best way to move forward amongst a lot of imperfect options.

So that's about as specific as I'm willing to get and I know that's not much. So let's hold it in abeyance until Monday and then we will move quickly from there.

Mr. Pomerantz, anything else from you?

MR. POMERANTZ: No, Your Honor. Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Ms. Riley, anything else from you?

MS. RILEY: Nothing today. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. The hearing is concluded.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript
4	was taken from a tape recording stenographically to the best
5	of my ability to hear and understand said tape recording,
6	that my said stenographic notes were thereafter transcribed
7	into typewriting at my direction.
8	Dated this 21st of November, 2017.
9	
10	
11	
12	Laura W. Robinson
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	